ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW
ED001817	NA	NA	

4. AUTHOR(S):
Record, Wilson

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
Minority Groups and Intergroup Relations in the San Francisco Bay Area

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:
Institute of Governmental Studies

7. EDITOR(S):
NA

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
University of California
ORG. Berkeley, California
ST.
CITY, STATE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE
University of California
Berkeley, California

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
NA	NA	1963	48

TELE. EXT.
INST/LOC CODE

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES ☒ NO ☐

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES ☐ NO ☒

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES ☐ NO ☐

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL ☐
IN-PROGRESS ☐
FINAL ☒
FOLLOW-UP ☐

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR
monograph report

16. INDEXING TERMS (6-12)

intergroup relations	San Francisco	Negroes	education	
minority groups	Mexicans	social culture reshaping	housing	
population growth	Orientals	action movements	welfare	
		employment	urban areas	

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 250 WORDS)

The nature and principal areas of interracial conflict are examined, with attention given to Central Americans, Mexicans, Japanese, and Chinese. However, focus is upon Negroes, comparative newcomers to the Bay Area, because of nationwide Negro-white tensions. The focus is dictated, also, by the political militancy of Bay Area Negroes in contrast to the passivity of other minority groups.

Subject headings within the study are: Minority Population Growth and the Development of Intergroup Tensions; Problem Areas in Intergroup Relations (employment, education, housing, and welfare); and Intergroup Conflict and Social Action Movements. Developments of the past two decades are reported, and trends and prospects are assessed.

Clashes will come as these groups, especially Negroes, break the bonds of their confinement. Efforts to deal with one problem without simultaneously attacking others are likely to end in frustration and defeat. Education may be an answer, but educational policies need to reflect the special needs of minorities. Ground rules must be sought for conduct of conflict with the hope of eventually realizing a cohesive community.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OR PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

ED001817

INFORMA
Ferkauf

INSTITUTE OF
GOVERNMENTAL
STUDIES

University of California
Berkeley

D40

Minority Groups and Intergroup Relations in the San Francisco Bay Area

1963

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION
U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN PRINTED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENTAL STUDIES
University of California · Berkeley, California
DWIGHT WALDO, Director

Minority Groups and Intergroup Relations in the San Francisco Bay Area

By
WILSON RECORD
Department of Sociology
Sacramento State College

1963

Contents

INTRODUCTION 1

MINORITY POPULATION GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF INTERGROUP TENSIONS 6

Negroes 6

"Other Races" 8

Mexican-Americans 8

Residential Segregation 9

PROBLEM AREAS IN INTERGROUP RELATIONS 13

Employment 15

Education 18

Housing 21

Indigency and Welfare Programs 26

INTERGROUP CONFLICT AND SOCIAL ACTION MOVEMENTS 32

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS: The Main Drift and the Main Chance 46

Introduction

In salient degree, the future of intergroup relations in the San Francisco Bay Area will be the creature of a single development of the recent past: a phenomenal growth in the Negro population and its concentration in restricted areas, actually ghettoes, within the Bay Area's major cities. The presence of those enclaves of color, pressing against their retaining walls, has become the central fact in intercultural relations, the central problem of public and private agencies which must accommodate their programs to the rising expectations of minority groups, the central challenge for movements grounded in the equalitarian tradition.

There is no suggestion here that other racial and ethnic developments are without significance. The primacy of the Negro question should not obscure the emergence of several new subcultural communities, notably the Central Americans; seminal changes in older subgroups such as the Japanese and Chinese; or the proliferation of Mexican clusters within and on the fringes of those localities, of varying size, which have offered least resistance to the incursion of low-status minorities that speak a different language and display a different set of mores.

The growth of the Mexican population has an importance second only to that of Negro in-migration and natural increase. Large Mexican communities are an old phenomenon in San Diego and Los Angeles; waves of immigration from below the border long ago fanned out along the southern perimeter of the United States, from Texas to California. Only recently, however, have Mexicans moved north as permanent residents in great numbers.

Emphasis on the Negro is compelled by three specific considerations. The Negro population is relatively new to the Bay Area, whereas Mexicans have been a familiar sight for a long time, if not always so large a part of the local human scene. Negroes, migrating primarily from the south and southwest, have a salient conspicuousness, their semi-rural traits standing out even more sharply against the Bay Area urban backdrop because of their color. The major, vital new actors in the interracial drama are Negroes. In the coming scenes they will have even larger roles to play and will move even closer to the center of the stage.

Another reason for focusing on Negroes is that Negro-white tensions have become nationwide in scope during the last two decades. An examination of them as they emerge in the Bay Area reveals a certain local

and regional uniqueness, but it also, and perhaps more importantly, reveals a similarity to Negro-white relations in the nation's other large urban centers. The claim of some Bay Area enthusiasts that more equitable patterns have developed here can be examined most critically in a discussion of Negro-white relations.

Finally, the Negro-white focus is dictated by the social and political militancy of Bay Area Negroes, in contrast to the passivity or mild protest of Chinese, Japanese, Indians, and Mexicans. The determination of the white majority to yield only slowly, if at all, to demands that present imbalances be corrected can but lead to further, more intense, conflict—conflict that will probably become the most crucial the Bay Area community is called upon to deal with during the coming decades.

Relations of Bay Area Mexicans to other groups, including Negroes as well as the majority "Anglos," cannot be neglected. No observer familiar with the history and current patterns of Mexican-Anglo relations would suggest that they are so tranquil as to merit only casual reference. This, however, is a matter of emphasis. Mexicans are not untouched by Negro-white conflict. Their responses influence the final outcome, and they are affected by it. Mexicans and Orientals may not play central roles in the ongoing intergroup drama, they may even prefer to remain aloof, but they are cast in a play from which they cannot withdraw; they have been assigned roles both tragic and comic. Though the final outcome is not known, one thing is sure: the actors themselves will help create the next scenes and eventually write the finale.

The time will soon be at hand, perhaps is here already, for a large-scale reappraisal of Mexican participation in California life, specifically in the San Francisco Bay Area. The Mexican's fate is closely bound up with the Negro's, and the Negro's prospects are not easily separated from the cumulative experiences, hopeful or frustrating, of California Mexicans. Social scientists concerned with Bay Area minorities might well make sociological study of Mexicans—their traits, institutions, values, aspirations, and, above all, their relations to the Anglos and to other minorities—the next order of business.

The encounter of Negroes and whites in the Bay Area, as elsewhere, has taken varied forms—avoidance, accommodation, competition, conflict. The last has been the principal way in which members of the two groups have conducted their association when avoidance was no longer possible, when frightened whites could no longer flee to the suburbs as bitter Negroes sought to break through the walls of the ghetto. Conflict, which is becoming large-scale and systematic, is not focused on any one issue but covers a wide range, each issue emerging from some vital need or aspiration.

In the continuing conflict, propaganda, political, legal, and even physical clashes will surely accompany attempts to resolve issues in employment, housing, education, social welfare, and civil rights. From time to time specific definitions of the issues will shift. However, the underlying struggle for full participation of Negroes—and other minorities—in Bay Area life, which is what the clashes are all about in the first place, will proceed unabated.

Institutions public and private will find, as indeed they already have found, that in one way or another intergroup conflict encroaches on their interests and commands some kind of confrontation and response, though of exactly what kind may not always be clear. Remote are the chances that the hope expressed a number of years ago by a white Employment Service official—that "Negroes will go back to Texas and take the whole damned race problem with them"—will be realized. In direct but also in subtle and indirect ways the growing presence of the Negro is reshaping the ethos of Bay Area culture, leaving an imprint on the gamut of institutions and attitudes. The Bay Area will not be the same again—that much is known.

During the past quarter century the response of Bay Area residents to Negroes has not been sufficient to resolve or even to reduce significantly the underlying sources of friction. To make matters worse, Bay cities have exhibited little competence in dealing with the by-products of their inadequate response. The failure has produced patterns of Negro-white interaction that are virtual duplicates of patterns in other large urban communities to which large numbers of Negroes have migrated. By substituting a few names and figures in accounts of Negro-white relations in New York or Chicago one can produce a strikingly accurate description of the situation in San Francisco, Oakland, or Berkeley. By the same token, New York and Chicago suburban areas have a marked likeness to those of Oakland (San Leandro) and San Francisco (San Rafael), where minimum requirements for residence seem almost invariably to include a pale skin. From 1950 to 1960 Oakland's Negro population, for example, increased from 45,000 to 83,000; that of San Leandro, which is separated from Oakland partially by a narrow creek, and at one place by a wire fence, decreased from 20 to 17.

During the past two decades the Bay Area, as perhaps could have been expected, has lost much of its uniqueness. Its physical appearance has become less distinctive; its new buildings are in the concrete and glass packing-box style; its freeways are as crowded and ugly as any to be found in eastern cities. Its culture has tended toward standardization. Deviant movements which seem new and creative all too frequently turn out to be fads whose chief support eventually rests on

those who see an opportunity for commercial exploitation. Finally, its social forms reflect little of an unusual history or of a distinctive way of absorbing new peoples and relating them to those already there.

There is no better evidence of the Bay Area's having joined the national society and having been caught up in the metropolitan main drift than the local emergence of national patterns of racial discrimination. In that respect, too, the Bay Area has arrived. Citizens of Oakland and San Leandro, San Francisco and San Rafael, Richmond and North Richmond, need no longer feel that they are being outdone by New York, Cleveland, Detroit, or Chicago. In the circumstances it should come as no surprise that the pattern of Negro response in the Bay Area is not significantly different from Negro response in other metropolitan communities.

When Negroes began moving to Bay Area cities on a large scale in the early 1940's, white residents were not without local precedent to guide their reactions. After all, frightened whites had almost unanimously endorsed the drastic uprooting of another racial minority, the Japanese, from the very areas into which Negroes were pouring. Although Bay cities, unlike the south, had no elaborately detailed system of sanctions and prohibitions governing all aspects of Negro-white relations, there was enough in the way of rough custom to indicate what could be done. The Bay Area had for guidance a long experience, reaching back a hundred years, with the Indians, Chinese, Japanese, Mexicans, Filipinos, and other dark-skinned peoples. That experience consisted largely of systematic exclusion of minorities from full participation in the life of the community, exclusion supported not only by white public opinion but also, in time, by statutory law, court decisions, and the apparatus of local community power. True, some self-segregation was involved, a consequence of minority commitment to cherished religious, cultural, and nationality values. But that should not obscure the fact that in most cases members of minorities had a very narrow range of choice—and the boundaries of that range were established by whites.

In the early part of this century, Negro visitors to the Bay Area were impressed by the acceptance accorded them in many public places and the apparently easy relations between their Negro hosts and local whites. However, more than one of those visitors, in diaries and letters to home, noted that Negroes were only a minute fraction of the total population, leading quiet and unobtrusive lives within small enclaves of dark people. They wrote, too, of the overt discrimination against Chinese and Japanese—and against those Negroes who were so bold as to assert their equalitarian rights. Negroes who migrated to the Bay

Area ir
tory pr
tion w
become
segrega
import
ants—e
the Go

In fo
and pr
effort t
papers:
litical–

Besic
Growtl
in Inte
fare); I
and Cc

lations

Finally,
tinctive
y there.
ied the
n main
rimina-
Oakland
l North
oy New
should
ay Area
politan

scale in
dent to
unani-
ity, the
ng. Al-
led sys-
o-white
ndicate
erience,
panese,
erience
all par-
ot only
urt de-
ne self-
nent to
should
s had a
ge were

ea were
ces and
d local
l letters
ne total
nclaves
against
so bold
the Bay

Area in the 1940's and 1950's found that although general discriminatory practices no longer had the open backing they once had, segregation was so deeply ingrained in the fabric of community life as to become for them the cornerstone of their new experience. Moreover, segregation and underprivilege will no doubt continue to be the most important feature of Bay Area life for dark people and their descendants—even those fortunate enough to be native sons and daughters of the Golden West.

In focusing on Negro-white relations, this paper examines the nature and principal areas of conflict. It assesses trends and prospects in an effort to comply with the primary task of this series of Franklin K. Lane papers: to envisage major developments—economic, social, and political—in the San Francisco Bay Area during the decades ahead.

Besides the Introduction, there are four parts: Minority Population Growth and the Development of Intergroup Tensions; Problem Areas in Intergroup Relations (employment, education, housing, and welfare); Intergroup Conflict and Social Action Movements; and Summary and Conclusions.

The Institute of Governmental Studies is pleased to present this monograph by Wilson Record as part of its series of Franklin K. Lane papers on the problems and future of the San Francisco Bay Area. Our intent in commissioning the Lane papers is to focus the varied competencies of the University on local and regional problems here in the Bay Area, and to do it within the scope of a single series of monographs. Each author speaks for himself in expressing viewpoints and opinions, raising questions, posing issues, presenting facts, and speculating on what the future holds. Thus, the papers will, we hope, contribute significantly to the continuing discussion of Bay Area problems and the search for solutions.

The series takes its name from Franklin Knight Lane (1864–1921), a distinguished Californian who was successively New York correspondent for the San Francisco Chronicle, *City and County Attorney of San Francisco, member and later Chairman of the U. S. Interstate Commerce Commission, and Secretary of the Interior in the Cabinet of President Woodrow Wilson.*

Shortly after Franklin K. Lane's death, a group of friends arranged for the establishment of a fund to be held and invested by Herbert Hoover, Adolph C. Miller and Franklin D. Roosevelt for the benefit of Mr. Lane's widow during her lifetime, and thereafter for some purpose to perpetuate his memory. In 1939, the three trustees acted to establish the Franklin K. Lane Memorial Foundation at the University of California, Berkeley. The general purposes of the foundation are to promote "better understanding of the nature and working of the American system of democratic government, particularly in its political, economic and social aspects," and the "study and development of the most suitable methods for its improvement in the light of experience."

In 1958, when the incumbent Chancellor, Clark Kerr, now President of the University, moved to allocate income from the fund to the Bureau of Public Administration (now Institute of Governmental Studies), it was agreed that the initial effort should concentrate on studies of Bay Area problems. The current series of monographs is presented in partial fulfillment of this commitment.

I express my gratitude to Wilson Record and the many other contributors to the Lane series, most but not all of whom are colleagues here on the Berkeley campus. Finally, I would like to thank Stanley Scott, Assistant Director, who originated and administered the project, and is serving as editor of the monographs.

DWIGHT WALDO
Director

Minority Population Growth and Development of Intergroup Tensions

Rapid and continuing population growth have characterized the Bay Area, and most other metropolitan areas, for many years. Not only has the total population increased greatly, but also the distribution by race has undergone very significant changes. In fact, one can get a good introduction into the nature and magnitude of intergroup relations in the Bay Area by looking at Census figures on population growth and racial distribution.

Negroes

Between 1940 and 1960 the total population of six Bay Area counties almost doubled, from 1,461,804 to 2,783,359.[1] In startling contrast, the growth of the Negro population was more than twelvefold. In 1940 there were only 19,759 Negroes, two-thirds of whom were in Alameda County, primarily in Oakland. By 1960 the number had jumped to 238,754. Though the *rate* of growth during the next two decades will not likely be so high, current projections indicate that by 1980 Bay Area Negroes will have at least tripled their present numbers, in the following steps: 310,000 by 1965; 414,000 or more by 1970; and, with a sharp increase in the early 1970's, primarily because of local natural growth, 586,000 by 1975. A continuing high rate of growth would push the figure well over 800,000 by 1980.

The total population of the six counties will have increased to 4,116,000 by 1975. However, the proportion of Negroes to whites will have increased from approximately $\frac{1}{12}$ to $\frac{1}{7}$. By 1980 it is anticipated that the ratio will be $\frac{1}{6}$ perhaps even $\frac{1}{5}$. Stated another way: during the period from 1960 to 1975 the Bay Area's general population will increase by about fifty percent while Negroes are increasing about 150 percent. These figures take on added significance when it is recalled that in 1940 the Negro population was less than two percent of the Bay Area's total.

Had the rapidly growing Negro population been more or less evenly distributed geographically and socially among the general population of the Bay Area, the multiple problems of Negro-white relations which have plagued the community for the past two decades would not have

[1] Demographic data utilized in this monograph are derived primarily from the U. S. Census, and relate to six of the nine Bay Area counties: Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Solano (the San Francisco–Oakland standard metropolitan statistical area).

developed in their present intense forms. Acculturation would have been faster. But Negroes moving into the Bay Area, and their offspring, many of whom have reached maturity during the past decade, have found themselves funneled into a few counties, and, within those counties, into traditionally "minority" areas, from which residential movement to other neighborhoods was extremely difficult if not altogether impossible.

In 1940 the Negro population of the six counties was slightly less than 20,000. Of this number 12,335 were in Alameda County and 4,846 in San Francisco County. Contra Costa, Marin, San Mateo, and Solano counties had less than a thousand Negro inhabitants each. As a result of migration during the war and post-war periods, plus a high birth rate, the total was in excess of 147,000 by 1950, representing a better than sevenfold increase within one decade.

In 1950 the Negro population of Alameda County was 69,442, or more than five times the number in 1940. San Francisco County showed a ninefold increase, to 43,502. Taken together, the two counties had more than two thirds of the Negro population. However, sharp increases had occurred in the other counties as well, with the most dramatic taking place in Contra Costa, where the Negro population grew to more than forty times its 1940 figure: from 582 to 22,023. Negroes in Marin, San Mateo, and Solano counties in 1950 numbered 3,257, 2,395, and 6,604, respectively.

During the 1950's the rate of growth was not nearly so dramatic. However, there was still a net gain of 62.2 percent, adding almost 100,000 Negroes to the population. Alameda County in 1960 had more than 111,000 Negroes; San Francisco County, more than 74,000. The number in Contra Costa County, which had sky-rocketed during the prior decade, increased only slightly, to 25,294; Marin County had a growth of less than 1,000, reaching 4,070. A big increase occurred in San Mateo County, where a better than 350 percent surge brought the Negro population to over 10,800. In Solano County the Negro group almost doubled, reaching 12,741.

Projections for the next three five-year intervals indicate that the bulk of the Bay Area's Negro population will continue to be concentrated in Alameda and San Francisco counties. In 1965 the two counties will have 238,000 of the 310,000 Bay Area total; in 1970, 305,000 of 414,000; in 1975, 392,000 of 586,000. Nevertheless, by 1980 San Mateo County should have no fewer than 226,000 Negroes, 9,000 more than San Francisco County, which will have dropped to third place. Even so, if the present rate of general population decline in San Francisco County should continue, the Negro-white population ratio might come

to resemble that of Washington, D.C., where approximately half the inhabitants are Negroes.

"Other Races"

In 1940, "Other Races" (Chinese, Japanese, Filipinos, American Indians, Asiatic Indians, and minor Southeast Asiatic peoples) in the Bay Area greatly outnumbered the Negroes. As the numerical relationship was being reversed during the succeeding two decades, the nature and locus of intergroup conflict shifted considerably. There were only 107,000 people of Other Races in the entire six-county area in 1960. In no county was the figure greater than the Negro total; indeed, only in San Francisco and San Mateo counties did Other Races approach the Negro total, the ratio in San Francisco being 6 to 7 and in San Mateo 4 to 5. In San Francisco County were located some three fifths of all members of the Other Races. In Alameda County the ratio of Other Races to Negroes was approximately 1 to 4; in Contra Costa County, 1 to 5; in Marin and Solano Counties, 1 to 3.

Mexican-Americans

Unfortunately, the dramatic accretion of Mexicans cannot be pinpointed because the United States Census has not distinguished Mexicans in its regular decennial counts. However, recent special studies by the Census Bureau indicate that in 1960 there were 1,400,000 white persons of Spanish surname in California, 576,000 of which resided in Los Angeles County. The San Francisco-Oakland Metropolitan Area had a total of 177,239, with 67,866 in Alameda County and 51,602 in San Francisco. In both counties and in the Bay Area as a whole Negroes substantially outnumbered the Spanish surname whites.[3]

It is not easy to forecast what will happen to the Mexican-American population in the Bay Area during the next two decades, since natural growth rates of the past two decades are difficult to establish. Information gathered by local public agencies, however, suggests the natural

[3] Detailed findings of the Census studies are not yet published. The Mexican-American minority is frequently treated as if it were a "racial" as well as a nationality, religious, and linguistic minority. Sociologically, Mexican-Americans can be thought of as a distinct group whose physical characteristics, coupled with their cultural traits, lead to their being discriminated against in a variety of ways by the dominant "white" elements in the culture, and to their occupying a general position closely akin to that of the Negro. Nonetheless, the Mexican-American has a better chance for assimilation than does the Negro. It is the Mexican's cultural disparity more than his color that sets him apart, and cultural disparity is more readily shucked than is pigmentation. The Spanish surname population also includes Central Americans, whose growing clusters, although relatively recent in origin, are becoming conspicuous to Bay Area social welfare agencies.

rate of increase will be higher than that for the general population, although not so great as that for Negroes. A decreasing infant mortality rate and a longer life expectancy will figure prominently in the increase, though a rise in middle-class aspirations and attainments, encouraging the limitation of family size, should have a somewhat offsetting effect.

What about the rate of migration as opposed to the rate of natural increase? Here again it is hazardous to predict. Migration trends will be shaped by several variables: national immigration policies, relative economic opportunities in agriculture and industry in the Bay Area, and the area's social and cultural assets on which Mexicans can draw.

Even if growth rates could be predicted more precisely, it would be difficult to foresee the magnitude and shape of intergroup relations problems involving Mexican-Americans during the coming decades. Some prescience about the rate of assimilation, about external changes and internal attitudinal and institutional modifications, would be required. Fluctuations in the number of Spanish surnames, as revealed by future censuses, will be of limited value as indexes of assimilation because of marriages of Mexican girls with Anglo men, the Anglicizing of Mexican names (Flores into Flowers, for example) and the fact that a Spanish surname may be kept by some families even after they have been acculturated. At this writing the least risky prediction is that the Mexican-American population of the Bay Area will increase substantially during the years ahead but will be slow to lose its cultural distinctiveness.

Residential Segregation

Cultural diversity is most likely to create tension when members of minorities are visible as a *group,* and group visibility is assured in Bay Area cities by residential concentration. During the past two decades much of the intercultural conflict has stemmed from the efforts of segregated minorities, especially Negroes, to break the bonds of their confinement and find the kind of adequate housing not available in the run-down sections to which they initially migrated. Because of new pressures building up within the Negro ghettoes—pressures which can be relieved only by more *lebensraum*—it is inconceivable that the future will not bring even greater clashes.

Much has been written about the psychological and sociological effects of residential segregation generally; in the Bay Area itself inquiries have added to a growing body of data. Some studies were inspired by efforts to develop ameliorative programs; their findings have figured prominently in hearings conducted by legislative and admin-

istrative bodies. Only rarely, however, have explicit or implied policy suggestions been adopted and incorporated in on-going programs.

The Bay Area's surface cosmopolitanism covers a basic racial provincialism that has been increasingly difficult to camouflage. The flagrant cultural separatism of the Negro slums at Hunter's Point and in "The Fillmore" has its precedent in Chinatowns and Japanese ghettos of an earlier time, when Bay Area whites had their first encounters with non-white peoples.

The length to which provincial restrictiveness has now progressed is reflected in the small print of the 1960 Census. In Contra Costa County 22,000 of the 25,000 Negro residents were living in eight of ninety-nine local census tracts. Put differently, 90 percent of the Negro population was concentrated in eight percent of the census tracts. Half the Negro population lived in three census tracts; one fourth in a single tract, covering the unincorporated and extremely substandard area known as North Richmond.

In San Mateo County, which also has 99 census tracts, more than 80 percent of the 10,486 Negro residents are concentrated in six census tracts. In one tract alone Negroes numbered 3,422—almost one third of the entire county total. The main areas of concentration are in the City of Menlo Park and in an unincorporated area known as East Palo Alto. Containment of Negroes in those areas will be increasingly difficult in the face of a mounting push from San Francisco and Alameda counties. Yet few if any affirmative steps have been taken by San Mateo County to receive effectively and distribute equitably the 200,000 Negroes who almost certainly will live within its borders twenty years hence.

In Solano County 9,643 of the 12,741 Negroes live in six of the 35 census tracts. One tract has more than 48 percent of the Negro population. Though the presence at Vacaville of a large state penal-medical facility with a substantial number of Negro inmates somewhat distorts the Solano picture, one finds in Vallejo a pattern of Negro residential distribution which in many respects resembles that of the more densely populated Bay Area counties.

Negroes in Alameda County are concentrated not only in west Oakland but in south and west Berkeley as well. In Berkeley slightly more than 18,000 Negroes live in seven census tracts in which the proportion of Negroes is 34 percent or higher. One tract, which is 91.5 percent Negro, has more than 4,500 colored residents. This distribution is reflected sharply in the Berkeley public schools. In 1958, 2,275 of the 2,682 Negro elementary school pupils were in four of the city's seventeen schools. In one school Negro pupils were 95.2 percent of the stu-

dent body. In the remaining three they were 88, 54, and 43 percent, respectively.

Despite the fact that in 1960 Negroes were slightly under 20 percent of the Berkeley population, their 5,049 children in the public schools were almost one third of the total enrollment. A 1960–61 enrollment survey disclosed that in five elementary schools Negroes were 50 percent or more of all the pupils. In a second school Negro enrollment had grown to above 90 percent (94.8) and in a third, to 90 percent. Eight of the elementary schools had less than two percent Negro enrollment, and four had no Negro pupils at all.

In Marin County the Negro population, which totaled 4,070 in 1960, is concentrated in two localities: Marin City, which is a few miles north of the Golden Gate; and San Quentin Prison, which is a short distance southeast of San Rafael. The institutional Negro population of the county, if subtracted from the total number of Negroes, reduces the latter to an extremely small proportion of the general population. It is anticipated that in the years ahead the Negro population will increase rather slowly and that even in 1980 there will not be more than 6,400 Negroes in all of Marin County.

In this connection reports submitted by the official Marin County Committee on Racial Discrimination in 1959 are instructive. "Responsible, qualified Negroes and Orientals who attempted to rent or to buy houses from 37 active real estate and building firms in the county were, in all but three cases, refused. One of the three houses that appeared to be available was priced ten percent more for a minority family." The committee also observed: "Minority families attempting to move into private housing in Marin County have been discouraged by reports of discrimination as well as by discrimination itself."

"It has become clear," the statement concluded, "that the inquiries of this committee have been consistently ignored by the housing industry in Marin County," and that "the housing industry here has decided upon a policy of resistance against any attempt to discover and remedy violations of civil and economic rights in the county." Continuing success of the "housing industry" in excluding minorities has been generally assumed by forecasters of Negro population trends in Marin County.

In San Francisco the Negro population is heavily concentrated in the Fillmore, Bayview, Hunter's Point, Western Addition, and Ingleside districts. The Western Addition is undergoing redevelopment and will lose a substantial portion of its Negro population, many members being unable to rent or to purchase homes at the higher prices of the replacement units. Of the Fillmore district a recent report states: "[It]

is a typical slum area similar to those found in most large cities with old, run-down and over-crowded housing and a high incidence of crime and delinquency. The recent migrant to San Francisco usually starts out in this area." However, the same report notes that there has been a continuing increase in the number of census tracts in which non-whites live, indicating some slight dispersal of the Negro population along with its expansion on the fringes of the older racial sections.

Such is the human profile of the Bay Area, a profile full of emotional stress, whose features are not likely to compose themselves for many years.

Problem Areas in Intergroup Relations

When members of an identifiable minority attempt to share more equitably in the opportunities and responsibilities of community life, intergroup tensions almost inevitably follow. Effective protest by members of minorities must find collective expression in organizations developed and led by the minority itself. A deep sense of injustice or outrage usually results in a forceful articulation of equalitarian aspirations, breaching the outward appearance of intergroup harmony. Minority protest and betterment activities are likely, of course, to evoke counter movements whose guiding purposes are to contain the unrest and preserve as much of the *status quo* as possible. Intergroup relations at any given time are a confrontation or compromise of the conflicting forces.

In the San Francisco Bay Area the largest, the most militant, and most readily identified racial minority is the Negro. In the years ahead, as in those recently past, members of that group are almost certain to be at the center of intergroup tensions. In those circumstances involvement of Negroes in sharp, sustained conflict with various elements of the larger white community is inevitable. The question is not so much whether there will be clashes, but how the issues will be defined, what the precise framework will be, and what instruments will be employed. Negroes are determined to be "counted in." Some of the area's white constituents, such as the Marin County realtors, are equally determined to count them out.

While intergroup tensions between whites and members of non-Negro minorities will continue, they will, in all probability, take a less overt, milder form. However, optimists who point to the growing "acceptance" of Orientals in the Bay Area as a favorable portent for Negro-white relations are likely to experience some rude shocks. For it may be argued, as one Japanese Protestant minister did argue in an interview: "A lot of us are congratulating ourselves on working for and securing wide acceptance in the community at large. But I suspect that we have been bailed out by the Negroes. They moved in and frightened the whites, who then found that we Japanese weren't so bad after all. They could stop hating us and start hating the Negroes."

In the Bay Area, racial and ethnic minorities continuously confront a series of problems that have a vital bearing on their day-to-day lives and impinge forcefully on their prospects for the future; employment, housing, education, welfare, and civil rights are concerns that have a unique and always challenging dimension. However, the respective

groups do not confront problems in the same way or under the same pressures, precisely. Responses to challenges vary, and methods for dealing with problems are shaped in part by the group's own subcultural values.

Housing is a good example. In San Francisco in 1961 only 33 percent of the total rental vacancies were open to Negroes (and those rentals were almost universally in existing Negro areas), whereas 67 percent of the total vacancies were open to Orientals. A survey of job opportunities for Negroes in San Mateo County in 1959 concluded: "The difference in the employment picture for Orientals and Negroes is striking. While fewer firms employ Orientals, and they are employed in lesser numbers, they are given employment at a much wider range of jobs." Moreover, the report went on to say, "Negro employees of half of the firms in both San Mateo and the whole [county] area are 100 percent in unskilled jobs. The problem for the Negro minority does not appear to be underemployment in terms of numbers of jobs. Rather it is their concentration in unskilled positions which have low prestige, low pay, and doubtful security." In one Oakland community, Negro parents have threatened to take court action to prevent the future *de facto* segregation of a public school, which would become almost completely Negro if the proposed redistricting of Mexican and Oriental pupils into an adjacent school takes place. Social welfare workers in Richmond have pointed out that while Mexicans are prominent on the dependency roles, they are not so numerous as Negroes proportionately; nor do they remain dependent for so long a period of time on the average.

These examples not only illustrate interminority differences in challenge and response but underscore the fact that it is Negroes who feel the dead hand of segregation most heavily in the Bay Area. Their efforts to reduce restraints—to achieve long-term solutions to problems of housing, employment, education, welfare and civil rights—will sustain, even intensify, intergroup conflict. Though for purposes of analysis the problems Negroes confront are best treated separately, it is patent that in real life they are inextricably linked. The connection between education and employment is close and continuing; it helps explain the rising ferment among Bay Area Negroes about the quality of schooling available to their children. The relationship of housing to social welfare—of the physical environment to the personal and social development of the individual Negro—has been illustrated in several Bay Area community studies. Efforts to deal with one issue without simultaneously attacking others are likely to end in frustration and defeat, a fact clearly recognized by public and private agencies

in Oakland, where coordinated drives have been launched on a cluster of racial problems as the only means of achieving durable solutions.[8]

Employment

The locus of intergroup conflict during the next decades will include the economic arena, specifically the labor market. Negroes, the most disadvantaged group in the labor force, will continue to be, as they now are and have been, a disproportionately high component of the unemployed, the underemployed, and public assistance recipients. At present between five and six percent of the total Bay Area work force cannot find jobs. However, no less than ten percent of available Negro workers are unemployed. Thus, the rate of Negro joblessness is approximately double that of the general population, a ratio that has held steady over a relatively long period, with only minor variations during the past decade.

The ratio is likely to continue. Indeed, there is reason to believe that the discrepancy might become even greater. Rapid automation of unskilled and semi-skilled jobs, in which a disproportionately high number of Negroes are employed, coupled with the nearly insurmountable task of retraining and relocating those categories of workers, could conceivably push the rate of Negro unemployment to three times that of the general population. Only if a real labor shortage were to develop would the ratio move in the other direction. Recognizing the long-term implications of high Negro unemployment and the likelihood that automation will aggravate the condition, Negro organizations such as the Bay Area Urban League and the San Francisco branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People have concentrated much of their energy on developing job opportunities for Negroes and preparing Negroes to fill them. The Urban League's youth development program reflects the seriousness with which automation's omen is regarded.

Studies of minority labor market and employment problems have been completed in several Bay Area cities during the past decade. The most comprehensive survey was done by the San Francisco Council for Civic Unity in 1958. That inventory, confined to San Francisco, produced the following findings. (1) Employment in private industry is still widely restricted according to race. "These restrictions are experienced most acutely by Negro members of the labor force and less

[8] With a Ford Foundation grant, Oakland schools, parks, police, probation, social welfare and other agencies are trying to hold back the spreading Negro slum and lift the cultural level of the peripheral Castlemont area, into which Negroes have been moving from the all-black ghetto.

so by Orientals and other non-whites of Asian background." (2) Although other agencies such as trade unions and employment bureaus play important roles in the labor market, "it is clear that in general the employer exercises, or may do so, the primary and ultimate controls over hiring, upgrading, and termination." (3) Employers, union officials, and others involved in employment processes express, "when asked," a general expectation of integration of minority group people in the local labor force.

A measure of the degree to which minorities in San Francisco have been concerned about discrimination in employment is found in their unified, and successful, effort to secure enactment of a fair employment practices ordinance in 1957. The ordinance, which had been proposed for a number of other Bay Area cities, was the first of its kind in California and served as a model for the state law enacted in 1959. Without doubt the legislation has contributed to a reduction of discrimination in employment in the Bay Area; moreover, the California Fair Employment Practices Commission will hammer out further modifications of hiring practices in both private and public establishments. Some employers and some unions—notably the Longshoremen—have voluntarily reduced or eliminated job discrimination. But persistent exclusionist policies in many companies and labor groups, barring non-whites from industries and training programs under their control, present a sticky problem for the commission.

At the abstract level, Negro protest organizations and labor unions appear to have a natural community of interests, a natural affinity, that is often belied by their history. Even when Negroes were a small part of the Bay Area population, local trade unions were racially exclusionist, with few exceptions. Some of them were emphatically exclusionist, even boastfully so. Andrew Furuseth, first president and patron saint of the West Coast Sailors, centered in San Francisco, once exclaimed that "self-respecting white men will not serve with Negroes."

When colored people flocked to the Bay Area seeking jobs during World War II, two labor groups on the San Francisco waterfront provided almost the only fissures in a wall that unions had built around their job territories. By petition to the President's Fair Employment Practices Commission and by judicial suit, aggressive Negroes tried with some success to break the wall at other places—shipbuilding, seafaring, etc.—a fact which did not endear them to unions controlling those job areas. Subsequent attempts to form political alliances between Negroes and unions to pursue mutual interests in health, welfare, education, housing, and so on, have been sporadic and tenuous, with mixed results.

Now a new problem has intruded. Some unions are experiencing decline as a result of mechanization and a shift in the work force away from blue collar toward white collar workers. Negro union members, if any, are often low men on the seniority totem pole, with the result that they must bear a disproportionate share of the lay-off burden. Unions that have never accepted Negroes are now likely to be even more resistant despite stepped-up pressure from the NAACP, the Urban League, and government agencies. Many employers and labor groups which have given lip service to equalitarianism have yet to prove that they will move beyond "tokenism."

The recent open break between the NAACP and the AFL-CIO at the national level, because of continuing discriminatory practices by AFL-CIO affiliates, may spill over into the Bay Area in the form of heightened militancy on the part of local Negro groups and sharpened resistance among trade unions. However, the basic pattern of small, grudging concessions by the white-dominated business and labor community, under sporadic prodding by Negro organizations and government agencies, would be unaltered.

No fair employment practice law can be expected to resolve the basic problem of long-term unemployment among unskilled and semi-skilled workers of minority group ancestry. In the Bay Area a continuing high rate of unemployment among Negroes and Mexicans during periods of substantial prosperity remains a disturbing element in the inter-group relations scene. It complicates and may even defeat efforts to ameliorate other problems. If trends of the past decade continue—and there is good reason to believe they will—members of Bay Area minorities will include an even higher portion of "unemployables" more or less permanently dependent on public welfare as a source of subsistence.

A decade ago certain Bay Area economists observed a narrowing of the gap between the per capita income of Negroes and that of the rest of the population. It was anticipated that the trend, which had gained momentum during the war, would continue, although at a slower rate. It now appears that the income gap is widening, with Negroes receiving proportionately less than a decade ago. Many non-whites, however, have not experienced the reversal and are not likely to do so in the years ahead. It is difficult to predict with confidence developments in the employment and income position of Mexican-Americans. Many different variables, cultural as well as economic, are in play. In the Bay Area, if not in the state as a whole, the Mexican-Americans' overall chances appear to be substantially better than those of Negroes.

In spite of the economic handicaps Negroes in the Bay Area have

faced over the years, an identifiable colored middle class has emerged with shared backgrounds, values, and goals. Its members have good, steady incomes from respectable occupations; they live at a level substantially higher than either their fellow Negroes or many elements of the white community achieve. Their rather ritualistic pretensions, reported and pictured in Negro papers published in Oakland and San Francisco, might lead one to suppose that their primary identity has shifted from race to class. That is not the case. They have provided the chief ferment in the Negro community. From their ranks have come most of the organizers of racial protest, challenging civil practices that adversely affect them and other Negroes.

Even so, the failure of the middle class to expand more rapidly bodes ill for Negro-white relations in the Bay Area. At present the Negro middle class is so small and so precariously situated that it cannot yet foster widespread civic sensibilities and pride among Negroes generally, or provide enough models of personal and professional achievement to encourage some young Negroes who might be able to break out of the oppressive patterns of urban slum life.

Education

One possible solution to the high unemployment and low income positions of Bay Area minorities, especially Negroes and Mexicans, is compensatory education developed on a large scale in the public schools. In effect such a program would be, as it has been elsewhere, a substitute for the functions ordinarily performed by a middle class. Two conditions are essential if the program is to succeed: public policies in education must reflect the special needs of minority youngsters, and minority peoples themselves must develop broader ambitions and a greater measure of self-esteem and self-confidence. The two conditions are, of course, closely related.

In the Bay Area there are current signs that public school officials are increasingly aware of the relationship between educational opportunities and the economic and social well-being of members of cultural minorities. Oakland is developing special programs aimed at compensating for early handicaps and redirecting the aspirations and capabilities of minority children. Similar efforts are under way in San Francisco, although they were obscured in the late summer and fall of 1962 by the furor over a proposed redrawing of school attendance boundaries, which, Negro leaders claimed, would have increased segregation. Failure to prosecute compensatory programs vigorously can only result in further deterioration of the relative economic positions of Negroes and Mexicans, with disturbing social costs and personal tolls.

During the next two decades the struggle for education may become as conflict-ridden as the struggle for *lebensraum*. In recent years Bay Area minorities, and again Negroes especially, have flung down the gauntlet to four sets of educational practices. First, there has been a serious questioning of the content of instruction. It has been argued that Negro youngsters are not being offered the most challenging and rewarding courses. Coupled with this has been the charge that many of the textbooks used—in history, civics, and literature—portray Negroes and other minority peoples in a biased and misleading way, enhancing an already strong sense of inferiority.[4]

Second, minority spokesmen in the Bay Area have insisted that public schools are abdicating their responsibility to Negroes, Mexican-Americans, and other minority pupils by not providing compensatory counseling and guidance services. It is suggested that the schools, of all public agencies, should be most energetic and inventive in seeking to break the chain of poor education, poor employment, poor family life, and poor life chances. The assumption that a school should merely offer educational services to those desiring and prepared to make use of them—rather than militantly assault the barricades of ignorance and prejudice—is being subjected to critical scrutiny.

Third, there has been serious protest against what is believed to be a practice of many school administrators, namely, assigning the poorest personnel to those schools whose pupil population is almost exclusively from minority groups. It is being argued forcefully that since the educational problems of those pupils are greatest, they need the most able instructors, counselors, and administrators. Coupled with the last charge has been the claim that Bay Area school boards practice discrimination in the hiring and assignment of minority group teachers, so that Negro teachers in particular have difficulty finding employment commensurate with their capabilities.

Finally, minority spokesmen are protesting vigorously against Bay Area school board policies of establishing attendance boundaries so as to concentrate minority pupils in a few schools. It is now being contended before the San Francisco School Board, and in the Federal District Court in San Francisco, that school boards are as much responsible for producing segregated, inferior schools as are exclusionist private realtors. The acrid encounter of the NAACP and the San Francisco

[4] It is one thing for a Negro protest organization to criticize a history text for not giving an adequate picture of the contribution made by Negroes to the development of the nation. It is quite another matter, of course, for the protest organization to demand that a novel or play which has an unsympathetic Negro character be removed from the school library. Civil rights movements, in the Bay Area and elsewhere, have been known to transgress civil liberties, but that problem is not discussed here.

School Board in the fall of 1962 concerning the boundaries of a new Central Junior High School—an encounter whose dramatics were fully chronicled in the local press—is a good example of what is likely to occur with greater frequency. Probably it is only a matter of time before the school boards of Berkeley, Oakland, Richmond, and other cities are similarly challenged.

Bay Area subcultural groups are not blind to the growing importance of education for an individual's life prospects. Among Chinese- and Japanese-Americans there is a traditional emphasis on formal schooling, a value that has had an important influence on the socialization of Oriental children. The need for education is taking firmer hold in the minds of Negroes and Mexican-Americans, who are giving their educational aspirations political expression as the nexus hardens between reading, writing, arithmetic—and jobs.

There is also a dawning awareness that the school is a social institution, and that changes in its composition and functions may in turn modify the people who are touched by it. The upgrading of a school may do more than provide a different kind of opportunity for learning; it may improve the minority child's own self-image, making an impact on his behavior in other institutional settings. Still another source of ferment about schools is the decision of the Supreme Court in 1954. The court held that segregated schools were by their very nature unequal; moreover, it did not differentiate between statutorily segregated schools (Birmingham) and *de facto* segregated schools (Oakland).

The *de facto* separatism of the San Francisco, Oakland, and Berkeley school systems has been repeated in other regions outside the South. However, the general emphasis upon and wide availability of higher education in the Bay Area is somewhat distinctive. Where tuition-free, high-quality colleges are conspicuous, the educational aspirations of minority peoples tend to be lifted, and more parental support of school efforts to inspire minority children is forthcoming. Without the stimulating presence of public colleges, the high school drop-out rate for Mexicans and Negroes might be substantially greater than it now is—and it is already high enough.

Though the general employment and income prospects for colored children is not a happy one, there are rays of hope. The highly dynamic labor market of the Bay Area is in the throes of major changes, and those changes further stimulate a drive for education. The shortage of scientific and engineering personnel has reduced traditional race barriers in private industry. The expansion of government establishments, and their demand for people with technical as well as administrative

skills have provided new job categories around which no practices of racial exclusion have yet been built up.

One reason for the inordinate concern about education is the fact that the minority populations of the Bay Area, especially Negroes, are relatively young. For a great many years Negroes will have a disproportionately large number of people of school age. (For example, Negroes represented approximately 20 percent of the total population of Berkeley in 1960, but Negro enrollment in the public schools was 32 percent of the total.) More Negro adults will have direct involvement in the public schools; many of the problems with which they must deal as citizens will have to do with the schools. Greater involvement may intensify conflicts between minority groups and school officials. On the other hand, it could lead to greater understanding, to a reduction of tension, even to active cooperation. In any event, involvement is the enemy of indifference.

Finally, the peculiar position of Negroes in Bay Area politics must be comprehended in order to understand intergroup tensions in the area of education. One cannot fail to be impressed by the extent to which political and civic action among Bay Area Negroes has focused on education. This emphasis is likely to continue during the next two decades. Among a growing number of Negroes the question of who sits on the school board is as important as who sits on the city council, on the board of supervisors, in the state Legislature, or in the national Congress. It is, of course, debatable whether Bay Area Negroes have employed their political resources wisely. The point here is that they have begun to take education seriously as a political problem. The City of Berkeley has perhaps been most responsive to Negro efforts to improve the quality of schools for Negroes. Berkeley city administrators and school officials have at least been willing to sit down and talk about the problem; a special commission explored the situation and gave wide publicity to a set of forthright recommendations. Berkeley now has a Negro school board member. Even so, the central problem of segregated schools remains unresolved.

Housing

Just as the problem of jobs interlocks with the problem of education, there is a patent nexus between schools and housing. In no other aspects of Bay Area life are intergroup conflicts so sharp or so sustained as they are in housing. Segregation on a racial basis has a long history in the Bay Area. It was only a few years ago that San Francisco public housing officials defended racial segregation in government subsidized units on the grounds that it was a historical neighborhood pattern.

Segregation is certainly a current practice, one that becomes more firmly established with the growth of minority populations and the intensification of racial ghettoes in every county of the Bay Area.

When President Kennedy in November, 1962, put his signature to an Executive Order banning racial and religious discrimination in housing built or financed by agencies of the federal government, he struck an official blow for equalitarianism. Two years earlier, during the presidential campaign of 1960, he had censured Mr. Eisenhower for failing to issue such an order, "which could have wiped out segregation with the stroke of a pen." Segregated housing is a durable institution; more than the application of ink is necessary to root it out. Effectuation of the Kennedy order requires vigorous prosecution of groups at the community level, plus a firm commitment on the part of the administration to use all the awesome powers of government aggressively and consistently. Will the challenge be met?

Most previous efforts to remove barriers against equal access to private housing were notable failures. The success stories are so few and so small as to engender only slight hope that San Francisco, Oakland, Berkeley, Richmond, and other Bay Area cities can break with what has become the national pattern for handling new waves of Negro migrants to urban areas, namely, concentrating them in older neighborhoods from which whites have moved on to suburbia. Neither public agencies nor private groups have been able to make much of an impact on the more or less systematic exclusion of Negroes from new residential property and from relatively desirable established housing.

Rarely have Negroes in the Bay Area had an opportunity to purchase homes in the spreading suburban developments of the post-war period. The resources of white groups for excluding Negroes and other "undesirables" are formidable and quickly mobilized when Negroes attempt to move in. The opposition to interracial suburban housing includes a wide range of interest groups and organizations that in one way or another feel threatened.

Most if not all of the protest about housing by such Negro organizations as the NAACP has been centered in San Francisco, Oakland, Berkeley, and Richmond. That is where Negroes are concentrated—where they have some political power to influence public policies. However, if they are ever to solve the over-all problem of adequate space and housing in the Bay Area, Negroes must extend their horizons to develop effective pressures against the suburban communities whose exclusionist practices compound the problem of race ghettoes in the cities. Oakland's public finance burdens as well as its racial tensions are a consequence in part of nearby San Leandro's discouragement of Negro in-migration.

San Leandro in recent years has wooed industry with promises of relatively low tax rates. To the extent that low taxes are an inducement to companies seeking new plant locations, Oakland, which must provide public services and welfare payments to an expanding Negro population, thereby raising its revenue needs, is at a competitive disadvantage with exclusionist San Leandro. Ironically, San Leandro may get plants which, if located in Oakland, would provide the tax base on which Oakland needs to draw in order to service the Negroes excluded by San Leandro.

During the post-war period, Orientals in the Bay Area have found it increasingly easy to acquire good housing in neighborhoods that had been primarily or even wholly populated by whites. Although most Chinese and Japanese continue to reside in fairly compact, racially homogeneous neighborhoods, they do have some real choices about where they will live. With money and determination to explore the wider housing market an Oriental-American can usually locate a suitable place. Moreover he can live there in a relatively relaxed community setting. Whites may occasionally express their resentment, may even take overt steps to prevent Oriental occupancy. Such gestures, however, are no longer so likely to be systematic or sustained.

To a lesser degree the same possibility offers itself to Mexican-Americans. In addition to white resistance, two forces prevent a greater dispersal of members of that group in the Bay Area. The first is their relatively low income, limiting the range of choice for rental or purchase property. The second is those cultural traits—language, religion, family and social organization—which produce strong tendencies toward self-segregation and a hesitancy to challenge in an organized and effective way the practices that make for enforced segregation. If there is a relative improvement in the income position of Mexican-Americans in the Bay Area in the years ahead, and if there is more systematic grass-roots organization in Mexican-American communities, such as has been attempted through the Community Service Organization, more vigorous challenges to both voluntary and forced residential segregation will develop. The Mexican-American middle class will have to form the spearhead, and its point may meet with less resistance than Mexicans dare hope for. However, if the middle-class Mexicans abandon the "barrios" and become middle-class whites, they will deprive the lower strata of the models and leadership essential to over-all group advancement.

If intergroup conflict about housing has diminished for Orientals and for Mexican-Americans, the same cannot be said for Negroes. Present tensions, far from being reduced in the future, may not even be contained. Negro passivity, even in Alabama, is a thing of the past. In the

Bay Area there is convincing evidence of the determination of many Negroes, not just the most articulate and aggressive few, to attack every institution deemed responsible for their subordinate status. Although one may question the form such challenges take, or the organizations through which they are presented, or the proposed solutions, it is difficult to quarrel with the motivation.

Since housing is of such crucial importance for a group's whole way of life and for an individual's very conception of himself and of his fellows, it will become one of the focal points around which Bay Area Negroes will make an organized effort. The inevitable clashes with whites will take several forms. Negroes will use their growing political strength in an effort to secure local legislation that will reduce, if not indeed eliminate, bias in housing. They will campaign for those candidates pledged to "do something" about housing for Negroes and other disadvantaged minority groups. Recent moves in San Francisco to use the federal courts as instruments for modification of local housing and related practices will be extended to other Bay Area communities. Concurrently efforts will be made to intensify the intervention of administrative agencies whose programs have a bearing on the Negro's housing opportunities.

These are essentially slow-moving techniques; they do not offer much prospect of short-term solutions to the Negro's housing problem. Meanwhile the latter becomes more acute with the disproportionately high rate of Negro population growth. Accordingly, it is reasonably safe to conjecture that Negroes will use direct action: picketing of discriminatory sellers and renters, mass protest meetings and demonstrations, and publicity campaigns to arouse Negroes and obtain public sympathy. There will be "block-busting" in those areas adjacent to Negro enclaves in the central parts of Bay Area cities, and "leap-frogging" here and there from the ghettoes into the outlying urban—even suburban—areas.

Urban redevelopment as it has proceeded in Bay Area cities, particularly in San Francisco, offers Negroes little cause for rejoicing. Private replacement units are frequently too costly for the Negro renter or purchaser. When his substandard dwelling is torn down, he is likely to move on to a similar abode in an adjacent area, as has happened in the Western Addition in San Francisco, or to create a new slum.

Nor does public housing provide an effective alternative. Public housing in the Bay Area has been patently segregated, in fact if not in policy. Socially and psychologically it is a ghetto, a kind of "reserva-

tion" where Negroes become wards of the state for all practical purposes, permanently regarded as inferior—eventually even by themselves. However, in the long run it may be incumbent on government to provide additional public housing as the Negro population presses harder against its barriers and private housing yields only slowly if at all. High-rise reservations, unattractive as they are in many respects, may eventually be regarded by some Negroes not only as preferable to their present substandard quarters, but also as an easier way out than contending with the multitude of forces militating against equal access to the Bay Area private housing market.

Of course, some Negroes will be able to move into white neighborhoods in spite of the many obstacles placed in their path. Though their numbers be few indeed, their experience can be a beacon lighting the way, demonstrating that barriers are not altogether insurmountable and that Negroes, if given the opportunity, or, more accurately, if they create the opportunity, do make good property owners and responsible neighbors.

In some Negro communities that have not deteriorated into hopeless slums and in which there is a certain family and social stability, it may be possible for the inhabitants to reverse the creeping blight, to maintain their individual self-respect, to develop a civic pride and responsibility. Adequate home maintenance and affirmative involvement in the well-being of the community as a whole are indicators to watch for. Even in some of the public housing projects—for example, Hunters Point in San Francisco—it has been found that low-strata Negroes are sometimes responsive to such appeals. North Richmond is another case in point.

Finally, it can be anticipated that Negroes in the Bay Area will develop, albeit slowly, some self-help institutions that may ease the pressures concerning residential housing. Credit unions, such as those organized by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, can make housing loans available at relatively low rates. It is not entirely fanciful to suppose that cooperative housing programs might be initiated by Negroes and successfully established with the help and encouragement of sympathetic white publics in some Bay Area communities.

At best, however, such ameliorative measures can make only a slight dent in the Bay Area minority housing problem in the years ahead if Negro in-migration continues and there is no let-up in the high birth rate. The crucial question is how the ensuing struggle for living space can be kept within tolerable limits.

Indigency and Welfare Programs

Housing is closely related to indigency. Bay Area Negroes and Mexicans constitute a disproportionately high percentage of public welfare rolls. In some counties Negroes represent at least half of the recipients of general assistance even though they are less than ten percent of the population. In one county 75 percent of the women receiving Aid to Needy Children are Negroes, althought Negroes constitute less than thirteen percent of the county's total population. Every county hospital in the area has an inordinately large number of Negro patients; clinics and other out-patient facilities are heavily utilized by dependent Negroes who are unable to afford even the most crucial medical services. Racial disproportion in public welfare dependency does not, of course, differentiate the Bay Area from other metropolitan areas into which large numbers of Negroes have moved during the past two decades.

In contrast to some other Bay Area minorities, Negroes have been slow to develop group-supported, self-help organizations. The Chinese extended family, a kind of private government, exerts considerable control over its members but also provides them assistance in time of need and defends them against threats from outside. The Japanese still have a number of closely knit organizations, rooted in language, nationality, and social custom differences, from which group members derive material and psychological support in stressful circumstances. Even the Mexicans, whose low capability for collective ethnic action has been lamented frequently by impatient young intellectuals, find in the Catholic Church a source of private charity on which they may draw for material as well as spiritual and psychological support. Such self-help institutions reduce public dependency, though they frequently obscure the extent to which members of particular minority groups are nonetheless indigent.

The Negro's dependency is not only unusually heavy but primarily public. The reasons for this are complex. Several historical factors are significant: the forcible, systematic destruction of cohesive elements in the African culture of the Negroes brought to the United States during the slavery era; the breakdown in the Negro family which slave sales fostered; and the systematic suppression of all efforts by Negroes to shape, out of their common oppression in the new land, autonomous organizations which, although they could not lead to freedom, might have channeled the stress and enhanced group consciousness.

Since the Civil War Negroes have developed a wide range of religious, political and fraternal organizations, but few of them have emphasized group improvement through self-help or a collective responsi-

bility for individuals who could not make it alone. Even if Negro organizations had been inclined to embrace welfare objectives more enthusiastically, they would have made only slight impact on the overall problem because of the magnitude of deprivation and the paucity of material and social resources which Negroes could have mustered. The small-scale, sporadic efforts made from the close of the Reconstruction to the beginning of the Great Depression were doomed from the start. Private instruments for dealing with social problems are the creatures of an affluent middle class. Today, when the resources of even white private agencies are being strained to the breaking point by a general rise in needs, it is unthinkable that the Negro group, whose business and professional class is so tiny compared with its unemployed and unemployable members, can "take care of its own." Negro income distribution bulges at the bottom rather than in the middle. Negro indigence will remain a public burden.

How much of an ameliorative impact will be made by the new nationalist movements among urban Negroes—the Afro-American Society and the Black Muslims—with their emphasis on racial superiority, separatism, and self-sufficiency? The movements are too new for a confident answer. The uplift and rehabilitative achievements of the Muslims when working with Negroes at the bottom of the social ladder—notably in prisons—are impressive, but it is unlikely that nationalist movements will reach the point at which membership and funds are sufficient to attack the heart of the Negro's economic plight.

Intergroup conflict in public welfare in the Bay Area has not been as persistently sharp as it has been in employment, housing, and education, although there have been flares of dissension over welfare matters. Dependent folk are usually socially weak and politically inarticulate. Indeed, weakness is part of the general pattern of dependency; the longer it holds the individual, the more difficult it is for him to break away. Indigents have things done to and for them by people who have the established rights and resources to define the indigents' needs and influence their behavior. Direct, overt conflict between those who dispense welfare funds and those who receive them is therefore not likely to be great. Controversy about public welfare issues is precipitated by those groups who are in a position to influence public opinion and shape public policies, notably conservative "city fathers" who keep an eye on public expenditures.

In any metropolitan community such as the Bay Area a major and continuing task of public officials is to define and respond to the needs of those who are impoverished. Highly urbanized centers invariably contain large numbers of people who are unable to go it alone be-

cause of personal handicaps or inadaptability to the rapid social changes in which they are caught up. Substantial portions of the public revenue must therefore be diverted to their support, with minimal standards that are morally sanctioned and legally established. In recent years the public welfare problem in the Bay Area has become primarily a Negro and Mexican-American problem. That should not be surprising in view of the spectacular disadvantages confronted and the fact that so many members of the two subcultural groups are so recently urbanized.

Public discussion of minority group welfare dependency in the Bay Area has not been elevated by the emotional and frequently uninformed pronouncements of those who are simultaneously resentful of the drain the problem makes on tax monies and unwilling to support measures which go to its roots. In the Aid to Needy Children program, Negroes are a conspicuously disproportionate burden; furthermore, in some Bay Area counties 50 per cent or more of the Negro children on ANC are illegitimate. Some critics of the program have suggested that there is something about Negroes *per se* that explains the phenomenon, the remedy being to deny assistance to the mother and her children, perhaps even to impose criminal penalties for fornication and conception.

Ignored in such facile definitions and solutions are the traditional structure of the Negro family, rooted in slavery, the social disorganization inherent in the migration of a semi-rural people to a highly urbanized community, and the general cultural denial to Negroes of opportunities to shape their lives in conformance with social values of the dominant white group. Ignored also is the possibility that the rate of illegitimacy—defined as impropriety—among low-strata Negroes is not so different from the middle-class white rate. Middle-class Caucasians have greater resources and incentives for avoiding, concealing, or aborting out-of-wedlock conceptions and births. Furthermore, to a large extent Negro illegitimacy becomes a matter of public knowledge and concern because the public is footing the bill.

Critics of the ANC program are rarely disposed to take either the long-term or the immediate steps essential to solve the problem to which the ANC is a response. Interviews with public welfare committee members in the Bay Area during the summer of 1962 uncovered none who advocated aggressive programs of birth control and sex education in minority communities. Great reticence even to discuss such a possibility was exhibited by a surprising number of public and private officials. They would no doubt have been petrified by the suggestion of free, voluntary, legal sterilization or abortions for ANC mothers.

In the Bay Area, programs of birth control as a solution to welfare

dependency of the unwed mother would find—have found—more receptivity among Negroes than among Mexican-Americans. No strong cultural taboos or religious restrictions restrain colored Americans. However, low-strata Negroes who embrace few middle-class values often lack both the knowledge and the incentive to limit births, in or out of wedlock. Attainment by more Negroes of middle-class status almost certainly will produce modifications of their reproductive behavior, as it has done for upwardly mobile white. Indeed, studies of illegitimacy broken down by class and race indicate that the lowest rate applies to the Negro middle class. Meanwhile, although there are some promising experiments with birth control programs in the Hunters Point ghetto, such programs may move so slowly as to make only a small impact on the problem of illegitimacy and dependency for years to come.

Of course, only a small portion of the Negro population in the Bay Area is dependent on public relief programs: A great majority of Negroes are self-sustaining, have not been and probably will not become public charges. The hard fact remains, however, that the Negro dependency rate is many times that of whites, Chinese, or Japanese. The disproportionate dependence of Bay Area Negroes on ANC is duplicated in other public welfare programs. Prolonged unemployment of Negro breadwinners may result in recourse to general relief. Insufficient funds in many Negro families make them dependent on public health and public hospital services even though they may prefer private medical care.

Minority peoples in the Bay Area, particularly Negroes, have used their political resources in efforts to shape public welfare policies to deal more effectively with group needs. Welfare has become a legitimate political issue to be debated publicly and decided by some minimal consensus. In the San Francisco Bay Area there is widespread agreement among Negroes on the place of welfare programs in community life. The most forceful advocates of expanded welfare activities are not necessarily the low-strata Negroes who benefit most directly, but middle and upper-class Negroes who recognize that the well-being of the Negro community as a whole is jeopardized when any significant portion of it suffers serious social and material deprivation. For one thing, Negroes in business, the professions, and the service trades are harmed when reductions in welfare benefits deprive them of potential customers and clients. Then, too, there are humanistic motives, and at that level liberal Negroes are allied with liberal Caucasians to protect the welfare programs.

Negro civic and religious institutions suffer when their members are forced to divert for charity a portion of the funds and energies that

might otherwise be devoted to realization of specific institutional goals. The Baptist elder, for example, who must give money to support an unemployable relative must subtract it from his total contribution to the congregation. It is recognized, too, that the ability of Negroes to participate in the general institutions of the community—its schools, for instance—is lessened all along the line when the minimal welfare base for the lowest stratum is reduced, or when it is not expanded in accordance with newer, more liberal standards and growing community resources.

No candidate for political office in a Bay Area community can expect to receive much Negro support if he proposes serious reductions in welfare programs. Without exception Negro-supported candidates for public office during the past twenty years have advocated greater public responsibility for solving problems of the indigent and underprivileged. In registration and in voting, Negroes in the Bay Area are overwhelmingly Democratic. Although not necessarily ideologically liberal, they stand behind "the welfare state." For that reason Negroes find themselves aligned almost solidly against white conservatives who see the Republican Party as the best instrument for advancing their views. Republican candidates in Negro communities have been saddled with the anti-welfare image of their party; it has not been a light onus, and it is not likely to become lighter in the years ahead.

It is difficult to anticipate the course minority welfare dependency will take during the next two decades in the Bay Area. Dependency results from a failure of social institutions to supply the motivations and resources which foster in individuals an independent outlook and the social occupational skills essential to sustain it. Community institutions cannot develop autonomy in every individual and should not be expected to do so. Some individuals for one reason or another always fall by the wayside. In the case of Negroes, however, the failures are legion. Thousands of Negroes lack the drives and skills most whites display. The result is a startling level of public welfare dependency and isolation from the mainstreams of urban life.

The problem is much deeper than the need to create opportunities for learning and employment. It entails the transformation of self images and group attitudes, a kind of personal and social rebirth, which is essentially the aim professional social workers have when they attempt to rehabilitate dependent Negroes. Yet one can hardly avoid being distressed by the limited success of such efforts. Equally disconcerting is the absence of large-scale preventive programs that counter the tendency of dependency to breed dependency. Second generation ANC support, for example, is run-of-the-mill among Negroes and Mexi-

cans in the Bay Area. Third generation ANC dependency will be far from rare in the next two decades.

The demands of modern-scientific-urban-industrial life, expressed in their most extreme form in American metropolitan communities, will become so complex that an increasing portion of the present as well as the coming generation will be unable to cope with them autonomously. Minorities in the Bay Area, historically and culturally handicapped, will almost surely find dealing with a revolutionary material and social world even more frustrating. Those who are unable to achieve self-sufficiency will become dependent on the rest of the community and inclined to make increasing demands on it as its total resources proliferate.

The pressure from culturally displaced people will make for large-scale welfare planning. It is difficult to see how minimal needs can be met without salient articulation of present services, necessitating a larger role for government and a relative decline of private social service agencies. Centralization of public welfare administration may be inevitable as the frailties of local control become more apparent, and as the welfare problem is shaped more and more by regional and national developments. Two decades from now an observer looking at the increased centralization of California government may conjecture that if local communities had dealt more effectively with minority welfare needs, the concentration of power would not have been so headlong.

• • •

Employment, housing, education, and welfare are by no means the only arenas in which intergroup conflicts in the San Francisco Bay Area occur. They are, however, the loci of the greatest tensions, where established interests and sentiments are most forcefully challenged and defended, and where there is most likely to be continuing, direct, face-to-face encounter between members of minority and majority groups, again most notably between Negroes and whites. The encounters are not usually a meeting of equals. Yet deference on the part of Negroes is being replaced by a compelling militancy, an insistence on sharing the good things of an affluent society. Prediction is a risky business, but present evidence does not suggest that the new trend toward militancy will be reversed. The Negro of the 1960's is prepared to be sacrilegious toward the sacred preserves of white supremacy.

Intergroup Conflict and Social Action Movements

In the San Francisco Bay Area, intergroup conflict takes many forms. Much of it occurs in informal, inconspicuous ways as individual members of different groups contend with each other in day-to-day, face-to-face situations. Organized conflict between racial and ethnic minorities, with the majority white group on the sidelines or perhaps even unaware of the contest, is a second form. A third is organized conflict between majority whites and one or more identifiable minorities, most frequently between whites and Negroes.

Examples of informal, interpersonal conflict are the interaction of a Mexican worker and an Anglo labor contractor; a Chinese home-seeker and a Caucasian real estate salesman; a young Negro who wants to learn a skilled trade and a white union official who excludes him from an apprenticeship program; a middle-class Jewish couple and young Gentile delinquents from "good" homes who subject the couple to a protracted reign of terror.

Conflict between minorities, whether informal or organized, reduces the possibility of a unified front against discrimination by the white majority. Unfortunately, much of the hostility which minority people build up in response to frustration is directed not at the majority group responsible for their plight, but at other minorities who are victims of the same basic prejudice on the part of whites, although the degree of prejudice may vary. The hostility may even be turned inward, on other members of the group and even on the individual himself. Intergroup hostility—or, to put it another way, the failure of minorities to make common cause against discrimination by the majority—has roots so deep and enmeshed that a detailed historical and sociological examination would be necessary to sort them out. Certain specifics operating against concerted action in the local situation can be pointed out, however, thus helping to explain why Negroes so frequently must "go it alone."

For one thing, minority groups are often strangers to each other. Japanese contacts with Negroes at the community level are few. Most associations are on an impersonal, seller-customer basis, with the Japanese as seller and the Negro as purchaser. Even though some Japanese and Negroes live in close physical proximity, personal association is limited and usually strained. In recent years the movement of many Japanese into the middle class, out of the ghettoes, has made for even

fewer direct relations with Negroes, whose view of the Japanese outmigrants is not mellowed by the fact that Negroes are left behind.

At the top, spokesmen for Japanese and Negro interests have established working contacts. Even so, mutual suspicions are hard to dispel, or the feeling that regardless of how hard they try little will come of efforts to realize common goals through common endeavors. Negroes resent the white's more ready "acceptance" of Japanese as students, workers, and neighbors. They sense that, indirectly at least, Japanese "acceptability" may have grown out of the Negroes' more frightening challenge to the white community—just as many anti-union companies during the 1930's suddenly found the AFL "acceptable" after being frightened by the more militant new CIO.

Negro-Chinese relations in the Bay Area are limited by the fact that most Chinese both physically and psychologically are still confined to what was once as complete a racial ghetto as could be found in the United States. After having depended for a long time on service work and the marketing of "cultural products" to tourists, many Chinese are now moving into professional and business occupations beyond the traditional enclave. In doing so they are following a path trod earlier by the Japanese. In the process the Chinese are not likely to encounter very many Negro fellow-travelers or to share vehicles for the remainder of the trip.

Chinese are not moving into general residential areas at the same rate as are Japanese. This does not mean that anti-Oriental feeling is stronger in their case. Though traditional Chinese family-political ties have been weakened, they are by no means severed; they continue to provide some refuge and protection. Furthermore, in dealing with problems of race prejudice, the Chinese are likely to take a mediatory approach, in which the pillars of the Chinese community bargain with the pillars of the white community for a redress of specific grievances, rather than a more militant organized attack on the system of white superiority. The traditional Chinese reliance on "go-betweens" and "fixers" to resolve conflict and save face within the Chinese minority itself thus has been carried over into intergroup relations. There is another fact which encourages the diplomatic rather than the militaristic approach, however: the Chinese do not now have the numerical strength, relatively, to storm the barricades of racial discrimination.

Not only has there been little contact between Chinese and Negroes, and therefore few attempts at joint action; there has actually been conflict and hostility on occasion. When the San Francisco NAACP a number of years ago tried to prevent occupancy of a public housing unit in Chinatown on a "Chinese only" basis, some Chinese leaders

resisted vigorously, insisting that no Negroes—or other non-Chinese minorities—be permitted to rent.

Negro attitudes toward Bay Area Chinese and Japanese are not improved by the claim, often by white public officials, that Oriental crime and delinquency rates are low, whereas those of Negroes are exceedingly high. Police Chief Cahill of San Francisco, testifying before the United States Civil Rights Commission in 1960, heaped praise upon the law-abiding Japanese and Chinese and made it clear that, in contrast, he considered Negroes a burden upon the constabulary. A disturbing feature of his testimony was his failure to examine the basic reasons for the crime rate differences or to inquire whether the low rate of the Orientals might have been bought at too high a price in terms of Oriental passivity to discrimination. With "Americanization," the Chinese and Japanese crime and delinquency rates may rise, although because the crime and delinquency are likely to be middle-class in character, they may be less visible, and therefore less talked about, than lower-class transgressions.

Negro-Mexican relations in the Bay Area are complex and not easily portrayed. The rapid growth of the Mexican and Negro populations and the tendency of the two to be segregated within the same areas have fostered more fundamental contact between Spanish and black Americans than between Orientals and Negroes. In view of the salient cultural differences between Mexicans and Negroes, and the unattractive physical surroundings in which their first encounters have taken place, it is surprising that sustained, large-scale clashes have been so few. After all, Mexicans and Negroes have had to compete for jobs and living space—in other words, for survival.

Mexicans have a special handicap—language—in addition to the usual ones borne by impoverished, newly urbanized groups. Though they are classified by the Census as white, and though they meet with somewhat less stringent discriminatory practices than do Negroes, their general condition, by almost any index one uses, is distasteful, often tragic. Low income, high unemployment, low level of education, high rate of dependency—all the old reliable indicators—point to a deeply disadvantaged position.

Moreover, as Negroes are quick to point out, Mexicans all too often seem reconciled to their plight, with little inclination to assert collectively their just claims against the rest of the community. When rare attempts are made to develop joint action programs among the minority groups, Mexican leaders seem unable to mobilize effective grass-roots sentiment; they often end up by bargaining through a few established, upper-echelon spokesmen. The numbers are there, and

Negro leaders are dismayed that Mexicans are not organized and heard from on every vital community issue. Indeed, it is a source of resentment that Mexicans tend to benefit from Negro protest efforts, while Mexican groups are not often deeply involved in challenges to white dominance.

If the political potential of Bay Area Mexicans could be developed and employed in cooperation with that of Negroes, the whole intergroup relations picture in the area could be sharply retouched if not redrawn altogether. It may be a mark of the Negro's absorption of American values, of his "Americanization," that he is willing to stand up and fight for equal chances, while the Mexican's "alien" background is underscored by his disinclination to go to the mat with white folk when his opportunities are arbitrarily blocked.

The third form of intergroup conflict—between one or more minorities and the white majority—is, if not the most frequent, certainly the most conspicuous. Authorized minority spokesmen backed by formal associations, committees, and agencies assert the needs of groups seeking to protect their interests and advance claims against the larger community. Some Bay Area minorities are developing a promising degree of protest and betterment organization; others may follow suit.

The growth of organized forms of intergroup conflict and action stems partially from the fact that in a metropolitan community formal associations tend to become the only means by which the needs of individuals can be publicly defined and asserted. Neither *ad hoc* informal groupings nor individuals acting on their own can expect to get very far, even when their goals are not vigorously contested. It is not surprising, then, that Negroes, Mexican-Americans, Japanese, Chinese, Indians, and other Bay Area minorities are developing protective and in some cases combat organizations in response to the demands of metropolitan life.

Other forces have also been at play. Although originating far beyond the boundaries of the Bay Area, they have import for what goes on between local Negroes and whites. The rising tide of nationalism in Ghana, Kenya, Nigeria, the Congo, and other African countries, for example, has not gone unnoticed by young Negroes in Oakland and San Francisco. The Black Muslims and other Negro separatists along Fillmore Street are not the only ones who see the fate of American Negroes as being influenced by, if not inextricably linked to, what is going on in Africa. Even more stimulating have been domestic developments reshaping the character of race relations in the United States. Probably the most important of these, and certainly the most dramatic, are the federal court decisions which have removed the legal props

from racial segregation and mapped the road to its elimination in practice. White San Franciscans and Oaklanders who thought the Supreme Court was addressing Alabama and Mississippi in its school decisions of 1954 and 1955, may be surprised by Negro challenges to *de facto* school segregation—for example, school zoning practices—in the Bay Area.

In the Bay Area itself a number of developments have stimulated Negro group consciousness and organized action: an increase in education, the growth of a Negro middle class, a general improvement in the material level of life, the broadening of cultural horizons for a long-isolated people, and the presence of a relatively large number of young people for whom traditional race roles are neither possible nor desired. On the other side of the coin are the persistent racial barriers to jobs, places to live, and adequate schooling. Along with these go the continuing indignities to which Negroes are subjected in their day-to-day lives, even in the "cosmopolitan" Bay Area, nurturing a growing racial sensitivity. Such developments stimulate collective efforts to realize a new order of intergroup relations in the Bay Area and reduce individual apathy or withdrawal.

One must be exposed to the unhappy, the sometimes bitter and despairing moods of Negro communities in order to comprehend the depth of discontent among Bay Area Negroes. One must appreciate the many indirect ways in which resentment is expressed as well as the indirect means of applying pressures against the white community. Formal Negro protest and betterment organizations, which are described later, are only a part—a small part, really—of the instruments through which Negroes prosecute their festering grievances against the "ofay" society and fight back at "the man" rather than run from him.[8]

The conspicuousness of formally organized protest movements, agitating for specific objectives, should not be permitted to obscure the importance of other Negro organizations—churches, fraternal orders, social clubs, business associations, and professional agencies, whose prime purpose is something other than fighting the race war but which nevertheless find themselves involved in racial matters with increasing frequency. Glance through a copy of the *Bay Area Independent* and the *Sun Reporter*, for example, and you are likely to read about a Negro fraternity in Oakland that is sponsoring a series of civil rights forums.

[8] Among Negroes, whites are often referred to as "ofays," a pig-Latin version of "foe." The word is also used as an adjective; for example, "It was a dirty, ofay trick." A white person in a superior or threatening position, or white society as a whole, is sometimes referred to as "the man."

Churches in Bay Area Negro communities are especially important. As a paradoxical force for both stability and change in the life of urban Negroes, they perform an often unsung function of linking the past with the present to provide a certain perspective on the future. They are much more than places where people worship. Prayer and subsequent "politicking" on housing, education, and employment are not necessarily incompatible activities. Indeed, as one Negro Methodist minister in Oakland put it: "We really can't be the children of God as long as we are made the step-children of this community." A Baptist preacher dismissed his congregation with this thought: "When we do thy will, O Lord, when we vote for good men on the school board, when . . . Amen."

Churches are the organizations to which Negroes are most likely to belong. They are centers of communication; they are the means for spreading messages concerning all kinds of activities in the Negro community—an NAACP rally, a boycott against a discriminatory employer, a political forum where candidates discuss their positions on civil rights legislation, a protest meeting on school attendance boundaries. Negro ministers, particularly the more sophisticated and public minded ones, almost inevitably become political as well as spiritual spokesmen, and their influence is unmistakable. They may even become office holders: a Negro minister was elected to the Berkeley Board of Education, for instance.

Politics becomes increasingly the means whereby Negroes, who—in the Bay Area if not in Birmingham—have access to the ballot box, seek to bring about new orders of race relations in urban communities. The assertion of power, the forceful deployment of group resources to achieve agreed-upon goals, and the overt challenging of white-sanctioned restraints are new experiences for many Negro newcomers to California. Just as they undergo a process of personal resocialization in an urban context, they experience also what Herbert Hyman has designated as "political socialization": they learn how to think and act in political terms. The relatively high voter turn-out in Negro communities and the development of fairly effective political organizations in San Francisco, Oakland, Berkeley, and Richmond attest the degree to which the transformation has been successful.

True, protest organizations such as the NAACP may hold public attention because of their singleness of purpose, their distinctive identities, and their dramatic public roles; but the nexus between public prominence and political power may be tenuous. The NAACP, the Committee on Racial Equality, the Afro-American Society, and the Black Muslims are beginning to realize that despite their reputations

and the admiration they evoke in the Negro community, they simply do not have the numbers to prevail. Their leaders are learning that to be even partially successful they must perceive and work within the emerging Negro community power structure, which is enmeshed in the complex machinery of Bay Area politics.

Of course, an effective use of the Negro's potential political power depends largely on the quality of leadership that can be developed, and in spite of the apprehensions of some white liberals, a shrewd and responsible racial leadership is coming to the fore. Already there is a convincing demonstration—in Berkeley, Richmond, and San Francisco—that capable and honest men from the Negro community will stand for something while standing for office, and get the support they need. The challenge to develop more of that kind of leadership is tremendous, but there is still the old danger that those who are successful professionally and politically may in time get too far from the Negro rank and file. For there is a persistent temptation to move "up and out" and thus deprive the community of leadership it must have to fight its way into the sun.

To move too far up or too far out is to lose the contact and understanding which permit diagnosis of basic race needs and mobilization of race resources. Perhaps the Black Muslims have been helped in their recruiting drives by a feeling on the part of low-strata Negroes that the successful members of the race leave the former to their own fate, letting them make their own way.

Emerging political leaders among Negroes should only rarely find themselves at odds with organizations such as the NAACP, CORE, and the Afro-American Society. Negro political leaders have recognized that, although such single-purpose organizations serve important ends, the Negro cannot put all of his eggs in one organizational basket. Nor can the most effective attack on white supremacy be made with a single technique or a single issue at a time. The Negro community has a striking homogeneity at one level, but it also has great diversity. The successful political leader must become the catalyst, the reconciler of differences, the articulator of shared goals, so that the racial hopes of Negroes can be effectuated in the larger political arena.

This is not to say that single-purpose organizations will decline in vigor or significance, or that groups pursuing diverse ends with diverse followings should disband. The contention is that such groups must find a common point of reference for concerted action, must be pliable alloys for the forging of an amalgamated instrument of general protest when the occasion arises.

In the past, the single most important protest organization in the Negro community has been the NAACP, a national organization whose local units vary greatly depending on geographic area, type of community, size of the Negro population, and the like. The quality and effectiveness of local chapters depend on the caliber of the leadership, local traditions of racial protest, the existence of competing organizations, and the personal traits of participants. Some of the Bay Area NAACP branches are well-organized and effective; others are unstable and incapable of making significant impact in the local race relations scene.

The San Francisco, Oakland, and Berkeley chapters have been the most resourceful in applying broad, national objectives to specific Bay Area situations. The presence of a regional office in San Francisco has obvious advantages. Negro members of Bay Area NAACP branches are a small fraction of the total Negro population, never more than three or four percent. However, NAACP chapters do not depend primarily on numerical strength. Their effectiveness hinges on their ability to recruit the most able and influential Negroes (and whites, if possible), and to build strong working relationships with other Negro organizations—churches, fraternal orders, professional societies and trade unions—and with non-Negro organizations which have a substantial Negro membership.

Though the NAACP has relied primarily on the courts, and more recently on administrative agencies, in securing the Negro's rights, nonjudicial tactics are sometimes used. For example, by publicising the failure of Candlestick Park to hire Negro girls as ushers, the San Francisco NAACP brought about a change in policy. By boycotting and picketing the Yellow Cab Company in Bay Area cities the NAACP broadcast the discriminatory policies of the firm, while the Urban League did the difficult technical work of recruiting colored workers and advising management on the best ways to hire and assign them. The branches have been active, of course, in demanding state laws and local ordinances to further the interests of Negroes in employment, housing, education, and law enforcement.

Why, in view of the heavy increase in Negro population and multiplication of difficulties confronting Negroes as a group, have NAACP branches not been stronger and more stable? In one city, branch membership was 1,100 in 1953; eight years later it was only 1,200, in spite of having reached two interim peaks of 2,200 and 2,700. In an East Bay city the local branch has periodically staged membership campaigns in which momentary success was followed by apathy and the

loss of most of the new recruits. The recruitment experiences of Bay Area NAACP branches are not significantly different from those in other parts of California and the nation.

Although the NAACP in the Bay Area will no doubt continue to have its ups and downs, it is not likely to disappear. Some branches have been active for twenty years or more. They have faced adversity and survived. They have rarely been diverted from their central task, although at times resources have been dissipated in inconsistent and harmful ways—in attempts, for example, to censor programs of public agencies, especially the schools. With the persistence of old racial problems and the lifting of Negro aspirations NAACP branches certainly have their work cut out for them in the future.

The NAACP's primacy in racial protest has been challenged by the more recently organized Congress of Racial Equality and the Nation of Islam (Black Muslims). Emphasizing direct action and seeking to involve both Negroes and whites in immediate challenges to racial barriers, CORE has had a special appeal to those of both races who have lost patience with long, drawn-out court procedures, which, even when successful, seem only rarely to modify the actual disadvantaged position of colored citizens. CORE has not, of course, disavowed altogether the tactics of the NAACP. At times it has actively pursued fair employment and fair housing in the legislature and courts. Although CORE membership in the Bay Area is small, probably not more than two hundred, the energy and dedication of its members should make its presence in intergroup relations felt in the years ahead. One probable by-product of its effect will be the stimulation of established Negro organizations to become more aggressive. Furthermore, although the sense of guilt which the dedication and courage of its members stirs in individual side-line-sitters may evoke a resentful, defensive response in the short-run, CORE cannot fail to pique the imagination and stiffen the resolution of an increasing number of those given to dilettantism.

The NAACP and CORE depend financially on membership dues and individual donations. The Bay Area Urban League, which is concerned primarily with Negro employment and education, is financed largely by United Crusade funds, an arrangement which provides greater financial security and organizational stability for the league but also imposes sharp limits on freedom of action. The league can enter the political arena only indirectly, and then it must depend primarily on the personal persuasiveness of its officials. It has no membership base in the Negro community. However, social service agencies

serving Negroes cannot avoid becoming social action organizations to some extent. The league is no exception.

Increasingly the league in the Bay Area has become involved in grass-roots issues which the NAACP and CORE have brought to public attention. The league's role has usually complemented that of the more politically oriented instruments of change. For example, the league has been one of the major forces in the development of compensatory counseling and education programs for Negroes in Bay Area schools. A school superintendent wanting to involve Negro parents more closely in the educational process, or a private employer being required to hire Negroes for the first time frequently turns to the Urban League's professional staff for assistance. The quality of league personnel has been consistently high. Indeed, one of its problems is that of retaining the outstanding professional people whom it recruits and develops and who are then much sought after by private industry, colleges, and government.

Although the three Negro organizations have different orientations and employ different tactics, they have much in common and there is a tendency for their activities to overlap. The NAACP branches in the Bay Area, for example, have used direct action methods in trying to achieve certain goals. The Congress of Racial Equality has found that educational and legislative action may in some cases be more effective than picketing and demonstrating. And the Urban League has come increasingly to realize that, in the absence of pressures executed by the NAACP and CORE, it would have fewer opportunities to apply its techniques to solving some of the day-to-day problems confronted by Negroes.

There have been and will continue to be clashes between the organizations. However, such conflict will probably be kept within bounds; certainly no organization will feel that its own survival depends on elimination of one or both of the others. In the past they have achieved a high level of cooperation in critical situations. The prospect of amity and joint endeavor in the years ahead is enhanced by the fact that there are enough issues to go around, that there is little possibility that any group will work itself out of a job.

Unity will be encouraged also by the challenge of the Black Muslims, whose exclusionist, separatist, Negro-nationalist movement appeals to bitter, frustrated young Negroes who have given up any hope of assimilation on the basis of equality. The Black Muslims have been particularly active in Oakland and San Francisco. A walk down Market Street on almost any weekday produces en encounter with a young,

well-dressed, extremely polite Negro man selling copies of the official "Mr. Muhammed Speaks." The Muslims have been highly critical of the NAACP, especially its local middle-class leaders, and of other organizations which aim at integration of Negroes in American society. NAACP branch leaders have felt the challenge of the Muslims, personally and organizationally.

Although the Black Muslims have, through their street meetings, "temples," and publications, laid bare the NAACP's chief weaknesses, they have failed to provide most Bay Area Negroes with satisfactory answers to the persistent questions confronting the race. It is now becoming clear even to Black Muslims themselves that the organization needs to develop a more precise blueprint of the good society and a clearer definition of the means by which it is to be realized. Two critical internal shifts now seem to be taking place: more emphasis on self-help activities among Negroes and less virulent attacks on the Negro middle class and "moderate" Negro organizations. If the changes continue, the spear point of the most acrid racial movement to appear in the United States since the 1920's will be blunted. But the very fact that such an extremist, separatist movement, with its bitter and potentially violent young adherents, could secure a foothold in the Bay Area is a disturbing commentary on the failure of community institutions to accommodate the new Negro.

While Negroes have formed the most active group organizations, other minorities have not been idle. Among Mexican-Americans the Community Service Organization is being developed. Because of its population base and political potential, the CSO has the possibility of becoming a strong force in the intergroup relations scene. The Japanese have the Japanese-American Citizens League, which has sometimes presented Japanese group interests forcefully, and often made a quietly effective defense of individual members in critical situations of considerable range. American Indians, late arrivals among minorities in Bay Area cities, are developing the League of California Indians, which must scale two major hurdles at the outset: (1) the cultural differences and traditional rivalries among the tribes and (2) the personal demoralization which frequently follows the uprooting of individuals from the reservations. Jews in the Bay Area have long pursued their group interests through the Anti-Defamation League and the Jewish Community Relations Council, which have fought anti-Semitism and fostered intergroup cooperation and education. In the Council for Civic Unity San Francisco has an unusual organization—a coalition and clearinghouse of minority groups. The CCU has demonstrated that on occasion it can achieve a high order of consensus on specific

issues; its durability and competence make it stand out among organizations attempting to unify minority peoples in programs of local action.

Bay Area minorities also carry on social action through many organizations that have other goals as their central purpose. As was pointed out earlier, there is a tendency for formal associations among minority groups to take on protest and combat functions. Negro churches have been cited, for example, as the scenes of ferment for better education for Negro children; Negro fraternal organizations are often outspoken on civil rights issues. The roles played by secondary associations vary, of course, according to the major components of the respective subcultures and the issues defined as crucial in the complex of group values. If assimilation proceeds satisfactorily, members of minorities tend either to discard altogether or to modify drastically the composition and activities of their associations. That is likely to happen, for example, to the Japanese-American Citizens League and also the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith. The Mexicans' Community Service Organization may realize only a small portion of its potential if either of two contradictory prospects materialize: quiet assimilation of Mexican-Americans in the larger Bay Area community, or withdrawal of members from intergroup conflict and repudiation of those values of the larger society whose realization requires conflict.

No discussion of conflict over racial issues is complete without mention of intragroup tensions. Competing or hostile organizations tend to view each other as monolithic structures, or at least as structures having a high order of internal unity. Negroes often tend to think of whites, for example, as a solid mass of opposition. That is not the case, of course. Despite considerable elements of cohesion and common purpose, each racial or ethnic group is divided by class, age, occupational, ideological and other differences which produce stress and make unity against opposing groups more difficult to achieve.

Only rarely do all members of a minority group define and act upon issues in the same way. Frequently there is a lack of consensus, at a critical juncture, regarding the nature of a threat or opportunity and what should be done about it. The increase in group action by Bay Area Negroes has come about despite the many tangential forces operating in racial communities. The promise of effective involvement of Negroes in a determination of their own destiny through conflict with whites can be realized only to the degree that race consciousness begets race cohesiveness.

Even within smaller Bay Area minorities there are divergent concerns emerging from differences in status, income, education and so on.

Although urban life imposes an alarming degree of uniformity-conformity on its residents, it also affords, at another level, a wide range of social and personal freedom. Minority group tendencies toward internal cohesion are frequently offset by disparate pressures that either isolate the individual in his despair, or confine his social consciousness to an expression of bitterness and a drowning of sorrows in the company of a few fellow outcasts. Sometimes integrative forces run aground on a latent mistrust of leaders and organizations which the minority group member acquires as a part of his own feeling of inadequacy.

Age and generational conflicts were clearly evident in the failure of young Japanese to resist the "relocation" program in 1942 until it was abundantly clear that Nisei as well as Issei would be making the long journey to Tule Lake and other concentration camps; that American-born Japanese were lumped indiscriminantly with their foreign-born parents as "the enemy." Subcultural differences—but much more significantly, panicky status concerns—are focal in the efforts of "Spanish" Mexicans to differentiate themselves from "Indian" Mexicans, toward whom only slight obligations are felt, and who could scarcely be regarded as partners in a common cause.

Negroes are not the only minority whose successful members sometimes succumb to the temptation to build an island of bourgeois comforts in the slum sea. That is not the real answer, of course, and even those who make the effort with some success know it is not. They can adopt the bourgeois trappings of their white counterparts and try to convince themselves that by rising above their less fortunate confreres they have risen above the race issue. But they do so at a price: the loss of identity. The alternative is to fight back at the false values of the dominant white community. In the struggle, middle-class members of minorities may discover who they are.

Fifteen years ago a University of California sociologist expressed the belief that "given a generation or two the new Negroes here [in the Bay Area] will move 'up and out,' as have the Jews and Japanese." That has not happened. It is not likely to happen in the absence of radical changes in existing race relations patterns. Even when they take advantage of the opportunities which an urban environment offers to develop life styles different from southern rural culture, second and third generation Negroes find themselves victims of the same disadvantage their forebears suffered. Perhaps this basic inability of the individual to escape his racial identity, no matter how great his personal achievement, explains the tendency of middle-class Negroes to remain in the fight.

The political and intellectual ferment in Negro neighborhoods

around the Bay mirrors an effort to chart new courses in the face of a failure of traditional techniques to achieve racial gains—not just *some* gains, but those particular fundamental gains that a growing number of younger Negroes regard as minimal. The emergence of nationalist and separatist movements among Bay Area Negroes, although rather small-scale until now, is a warning that the integrationist efforts of Negro and white middle-class liberals may come to be weighed and found wanting by a growing number of angry young black men. Alternatives which emphasize the Negro's racial identity and the use of racial power in the service of racial interests are becoming more respectable in the Negro community.

Achievement of a high degree of unity on specific programs is not precluded by the internal differences which are now more readily discernible as news about Bay Area Negro movement is reported to an increasingly interested and apprehensive white society. Only recently a miscellany of Negro organizations came together in a conference on the "Mind of the Ghetto," with both extremist and conventional leaders addressing themselves to specific Negro problems and showing a disposition to modify their views in the interest of collective racial action. Another unity attempt is being made through the Western Christian Leadership Conference, which has received encouraging support from Bay Area Negroes. These and similar developments counter the seeming lack of cohesion and sense of community among Bay Area Negroes so frequently emphasized by outsiders, and conceded by Negroes themselves in their more despairing moods.

Summary and Conclusions: The Main Drift and the Main Chance

Intergroup relations in the San Francisco Bay Area are part of an exceedingly complex pattern of social interaction as people of many different backgrounds, interests and aspirations encounter each other within the framework of a dynamic metropolitan community. In the past the Bay Area as a whole, and particularly its larger cities, showed some capacity to absorb a wide range of influences introduced by new groups, and to fit diverse peoples into an ongoing, evolving society which, while it changed, retained the flavor of its original character.

That capacity, however, was neither so great as Bay Area enthusiasts proclaimed nor so promising as public-spirited men wanted to believe. The enthusiasts ignored the minority peoples who failed to get a toehold on the social ladder; they minimized the price of assimilation paid by those who partially succeeded. Even so, it was long possible to look at the Bay Area and feel that the cultural and racial diversity was acceptable and desirable, that cosmopolitanism was a civic good to be encouraged. Surely time would smooth the rough edges of conflict and enrich the quality of intergroup relations.

For many decades such hopes were sustained by substantial achievements. They were not abandoned even in the face of a periodic public hysteria which victimized helpless racial minorities. They withstood the successful efforts of powerful groups to write their private prejudices into public law. The early cosmopolitan themes are echoed even today in the pronouncements of officials of Bay Area cities who stress intergroup cooperation and express the belief that present tensions are only temporary, that they will be dealt with effectively in time—hopefully, *by* time.

Optimism is being diluted, however, by a growing uneasiness, well-expressed by San Francisco's Mayor George Christopher in his testimony before the Federal Civil Rights Commission:

> We have tried very, very hard over a period of years to resolve some of these [intergroup] differences and exemplifications of bigotry and intolerance and misunderstandings that from time to time arise in every city in the Nation. And while we have succeeded in a measurable degree in doing away with some of these misunderstandings, I shall be the first to acknowledge that we have some room for improvement here in San Francisco, despite our tradi-

> tional background of understanding among the ethnic groups. We are not exempt from the problems. . . .

A similar but less sanguine note was sounded by a councilman in an East Bay city who said:

> As long as it was a question of the Chinese and Japanese and even the Mexicans we could expect to get along fairly well, although none of them was ever fully accepted. But with the Negroes it is a different story. We haven't absorbed them, and I don't see how we are going to.

The Bay Area's failure bespeaks more than a temporary lapse in a general assimilative process that has gone on during the past hundred years. It suggests something deeper and more disturbing not only about the local community but also about the region and nation as a whole. It suggests that America is a civilization whose dominant traits and values have been shaped as much by racial differences and sensibilities as by any other force. It underscores the extent to which contemporary American behavior derives from and is guided by race consciousness. Appropriately, much has been written about racial antipathy and its implications for the personalities and perspectives of Negroes. Not nearly enough has been said about the way in which that same antipathy has become deeply rooted in our culture or the pervasive influence it has on the socialization of all Americans, including whites.

This theme has been elaborated by the author elsewhere, and the details need not be repeated here. The thesis helps order a considerable amount of sociological and historical material. It helps explain a phenomenon future historians may look back on as one of the profound tragedies of this century: the failure of some metropolitan communities to keep Negro-white conflict within reasonable bounds, and the failure of almost all urban communities to assimilate people of another race who came to cities seeking a break with their disadvantaged past, who sought in urban centers an opportunity to enter the mainstream of American life.

For those failures metropolitan communities have paid and will continue to pay a heavy price. The money costs can be calculated by an examination of expenditures for welfare, law enforcement, education, and other services on which Negroes are disproportionately dependent. The indirect, important, long-term costs—not primarily economic but psychological and social—are less readily measured. But there can be little doubt that they are enormous—and inevitable.

Because they have failed to assimilate Negroes, the metropolitan

areas will suffer disturbing losses, including a creeping blight. Their physical character and appearance will be transformed and their demographic patterns will shift as whites move to fringe and suburb, while Negroes are restricted to deteriorating central sections or pocketed in ghettoes here and there. They will also lose much of their individual "tone" and character, derived largely from a distinctive mixing of peoples of diverse backgrounds, cultures, and social orientations.

If Bay Area communities had done a more effective job of making room for Negro newcomers during the past two decades, one could be more hopeful about the two decades ahead, a period in which the Negro population will more than double. In looking at developments since 1940 one cannot avoid being struck by the fantastic growth of the Negro population and the rapid development of Negro-white tensions. Equally impressive is the fact that not a single city in the Bay Area had, or tried to develop, plans for easing the movement of Negroes or for directing inescapable conflicts into affirmative civic channels. Perhaps that was too much to expect. Yet it was the minimum requirement for casting race relations in a mold that would have been uniquely *Bay Area.*

By now it should be clear that intergroup relations, and particularly Negro-white relations, can be left to chance only at grave risk. If communities are unable to plan in the area of human relations so that certain ethical norms and constitutional principles as well as civic needs are met, the initiative is likely to pass to other hands. It may be necessary for the Supreme Court in Washington to tell a school official in Oakland that discriminatory school boundaries are inconsistent with the constitutional guarantee of equal protection of the law. If it comes to that, Bay Area Negroes will learn again where their interests lie and what their choices are. After all, has not the Negro's great and last hope always been the United States Constitution and federal authority when local and state institutions failed him, whether in Mississippi or California?

A new and equitable basis of Negro-white relations in the Bay Area could develop out of present tensions. Past experience offers little hope that it will. Long conflict is in prospect; the better part of realism is to seek some ground rules for its conduct rather than to hope it will go away. Neither lament for opportunities lost nor numbness in the face of complexity is an effective response for citizens of the Bay Area who still wish to realize the rich human values of civic life in a democracy.